



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO.193 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-31  
AND AMENDMENT NO.187 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-41

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

TURKEY POINT UNIT NOS. 3 AND 4

DOCKET NOS. 50-250 AND 50-251

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 17, 1996, Florida Power and Light (the licensee) submitted for staff review and approval its assessment of the plant-specific applicability of Westinghouse topical report, WCAP-14535, "Topical Report on Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Inspection Elimination," to its Turkey Point 3 and 4 plants. In addition, the licensee requested an amendment to Technical Specification (TS) 4.4.10 regarding the change of reactor coolant pump (RCP) flywheels inspection intervals to be in accordance with the conclusion of the safety evaluation report (SE) on WCAP-14535.

The function of RCP in the reactor coolant system (RCS) of a pressurized water reactor (PWR) plant is to maintain an adequate cooling flow rate by circulating a large volume of primary coolant water at a high temperature and pressure through the RCS. A concern over overspeed of the RCP and its potential for failure led to the issuance of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.14 in 1971. Since then, all licensees for PWR plants, with very few exceptions, have adopted the guidelines of RG 1.14 to conduct their RCP flywheel examinations. These items are normally specified in the individual plant's Technical Specifications as is the case for Turkey Point 3 and 4.

In a September 12, 1996 letter to Mr. Sushil C. Jain from Brian W. Sheron (USNRC), the staff issued the SE on the Westinghouse topical report WCAP-14535. The SE concluded that the inspection interval of 10 years was justified for: (1) flywheels made of SA 533 B material and do not belong to Group 10 and 15; (2) flywheels made of SA 533 B material and belong to these two groups if justified by some additional analyses. To justify a change in the flywheel inspection interval for flywheels not made of SA 533 B material, an assessment must be made using the same methodology as in WCAP-14535, and using the appropriate material properties.

ENCLOSURE 3

9702130221 970211  
PDR ADOCK 05000250  
P PDR



## 2.0 EVALUATION

In the SE to the Westinghouse topical report WCAP-14535, the staff determined that the methodology in WCAP-14535 is appropriate for evaluating RCP flywheels and the criteria are in accordance with the design criteria of Rg 1.14 for a fatigue life of at least 10 years. In the SE, the staff specified:

(1) Licensees who plan to submit a plant-specific application of this topical report for flywheels made of SA 533 B material need to confirm that their flywheels are made of SA 533 B material. Further, licensees having Group-15 flywheels need to demonstrate that material properties of their A516 material is equivalent to SA 533 B material, and its reference temperature,  $RT_{NDT}$ , is less than 30°F.

(2) Licensees who plan to submit a plant-specific application of this topical report for their flywheels not made of SA 533 B or A516 material need to either demonstrate that their flywheel material properties are bounded by those of SA 533 B material, or provide the minimum specified ultimate tensile stress,  $S_u$ , the fracture toughness,  $K_{Ic}$ , and the reference temperature,  $RT_{NDT}$ , for that material. For the latter, the licensees should employ these material properties, and use the methodology in the topical report, as extended in the two responses to the staff's request for additional information (RAI), to provide an assessment to justify a change in inspection schedule for their plants.

(3) Licensees meeting either (1) or (2) above should either conduct a qualified in-place ultrasonic testing (UT) examination of the volume from the inner bore of the flywheel to the circle of one-half the outer radius or conduct a surface examination (MT and/or PT) of exposed surfaces defined by the volume of the disassembled flywheels once every 10 years. The staff considers this 10-year inspection requirement not burdensome when the flywheel inspection is conducted during scheduled inservice inspection or RCP motor maintenance. This would provide an appropriate level of defense indepth.

The licensee confirmed in its submittal that the flywheels for Turkey Point 3 and 4 are made of SA 533 B material, and they do not belong to either Group 10 or Group 15 flywheels. Therefore, the plant-specific applicability of WCAP-14535 to Turkey Point 3 and 4 has been established, and the 10-year inspection requirement with details specified above should be followed.

## 3.0 SUMMARY

The Materials and Chemical Engineering Branch of the Division of Engineering has reviewed this submittal. The staff has determined that the analysis in the Westinghouse topical report WCAP-14535 is applicable to the Turkey Point 3 and 4 plants. Hence, the staff accepts the licensee's proposed change to TS 4.4.10: "In addition to the requirements of Specification 4.0.5, each reactor coolant pump flywheel shall be inspected at least once every 10 years, by either conducting an in-plane ultrasonic examination over the volume from the inner bore of the flywheel to the circle of one-half the outer radius, or conduct a surface examination (magnetic particle and/or liquid penetrant) of exposed surfaces of the disassembled flywheel."



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

x

#### 4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

Based upon the written notice of the proposed amendments, the Florida State official had no comments.

#### 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes the surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (62 FR 1476). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

#### 6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Simon Sheng

Dated: February 11, 1997

